

## REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application and stand rejected. By the above amendment, claims 1, 20, and 26 are amended. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections set forth in the Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

(1) Claims 1-9 and 26-29 are rejected as being anticipated by Horvitz (US Patent No. 6,260,035).

Applicants respectfully submit that at the very minimum, claims 1 and 26 are patentably distinct and patentable over Horvitz as Horvitz does not teach or fairly suggest a methods for generating a reusable executable procedure by processing aligned execution traces to create a reusable executable procedure that can be automatically performed by invoking the reusable executable procedure.

In formulating the rejection, the Examiner relies on Horvitz's teachings (in FIG. 2, blocks 56-60, Col. 9, lines 18-32, Col. 10, lines 32-58, FIG. 8, block 106; and Col. 15, lines 3-8) as teaching the claimed process of *processing aligned execution traces to create a reusable executable procedure associated with said procedure*. However, the Examiner offers no supporting explanation regarding the reliance on the cited sections. In any event, the cited sections seemingly do not teach a process of creating a reusable executable procedure, much less an executable procedure that may be automatically executed, as recited in claims 1 and 26.

In contrast, Horvitz teaches a process of monitoring and recording user atomic events when interacting with an application, for the purpose of providing intelligent user assistance. Horvitz teaches methods for observing and modeling user interaction behaviors to created models that enable the system to determine when a user experiences difficulties in using an

application. The models are processed using inference engines to form and evaluate multiple hypotheses of what assistance a user may need when interacting with an application (see, e.g., Col. 6, lines 4-29; Col. 7, lines 29-67). The modeled event database (106) in FIG. 6 of Horvitz (as cited by the Examiner) relates to a modeled event database definition (see Col. 15, lines 1-5, and Col 13, lines 30-65), but the “modeled events” as taught by Horvitz are not fairly characterized as being “reusable executable procedures” within the context of claims 1 and 29.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 26 are patentably distinct and patentable over Horvitz. Moreover, without elaboration, claims 2-9 and 27-29 are patentable over Horvitz at least by virtue of their dependence from respective base claims 1 and 26.

(2) Claims 1, 10, 20, 26, and 30 are rejected as being anticipated by Mayuzumi (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,644). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

#### **Claims 1 and 26**

With regard to claims 1 and 26, Mayuzumi clearly does not teach or suggest a process or generating a reusable executable procedure by, e.g., *obtaining a plurality of execution traces, wherein each execution trace represents an execution instance of a procedure, aligning said execution traces to identify corresponding steps between said execution traces; and processing said aligned execution traces to create a reusable executable procedure.*

In formulating the rejection of claims 1 and 26, the Examiner relies essentially on FIG. 5 of Mayuzumi, wherein the Examiner cites the database (13) as teaching the claimed *execution traces* and cites the sequence data forming means (15) as teaching the claimed process of *aligning the execution traces* . . . . Although the Examiner offers no supporting explanation with

regard to reliance of FIG. 5 in this regard, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner's reliance is misplaced.

Indeed, Mayuzumi teaches that the database (13) in FIG. 5 stores a plurality of “*multimedia data parts*” that are obtained by disassembling multimedia information into parts (or minimum content units), and that the “sequence data forming means (15) forms a sequence of data made up of key data designating each of the multimedia parts for the purpose of determining an order of producing plural voluntary multi-media part in the database (13) based on instructions received through an input unit (14) (see, Col. 10, line 55 – Col. 11, line 2).

In view of the above, it is not clear how the Examiner finds that the process of *obtaining a plurality of execution traces, wherein each execution trace represents an execution instance of a procedure* is the same or even similar to Mayuzumi's teachings of a database (13) containing unit content multimedia data parts. Applicants request that the Examiner explain how “unit content data parts” are the same as “execution traces representing a procedure.” Moreover, in view of the above, it is not clear how the Examiner finds that the process of *aligning said execution traces to identify corresponding steps between said execution traces* is the same or even similar to Mayuzumi's teachings of a sequence data forming means (15) that forms sequence data by assembling a plurality of unit data parts in a sequence. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a supporting explanation for the above findings.

#### **Claims 10 and 30**

With regard to claims 10 and 30, the Examiner relies on FIG. 16 and supporting explanation in Col 20, lines 15-29 and Col. 21, lines 1-17 of Mayuzumi at teaching the claimed process of *launching a reusable executable procedure, automatically executing procedure steps*

*associated with said reusable executable procedure, and relinquishing control of execution of said reusable procedure to a user, when a next step of said reusable executable procedure cannot be successfully executed.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

On a fundamental level, as explained above, Mayuzumi does not specifically teach a “reusable executable procedure” within the context of the claimed inventions. Indeed, as noted above, and Mayuzumi teaches a method for dynamically generating a sequence of data parts based on the type of help information needed at a given time (i.e., depending on a given event or combination of events) (see, e.g., Col. 19, lines 35 – Col. 20, line 9). In this regard, the sequence of data parts is not maintained as “reusable executable procedures” per se. Although Mayuzumi arguably teaches execution process of a help procedure in FIG. 16, the procedure is clearly not persistently stored as a reusable procedure. Moreover, Mayuzumi teaches in FIG. 16 a method in which help screens are presented to a user illustrating a process flow for sequential work that can be performed to recover from an error (see, Col. 20, lines 52-67, FIG. 15).

In this regard, the process flows are not automatically executed as part of a reusable executable procedure, but are merely dynamically generated based on one or more events, and then displayed to provide user guidance in manually performing a given task as suggested in the displayed process flow. For at least these reasons, claims 10 and 30 are patentably distinct and patentable over Mayuzumi.

#### **Claim 20**

With regard to claim 20, for similar reasons discussed above, Applicants assert that Mayuzumi does not teach or suggest, for example, *processing a plurality of execution traces associated with instances of an executed procedure to generate a reusable executable procedure*, as recited in claim 20. Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner ‘s reliance

on FIG. 20, block 71 (operating guidance recording file) and Col. 27, lines 7-24 as teaching the claimed “procedure trace history” and block 74 (guidance data support processing unit) as teaching a claimed process of processing a plurality of execution traces . . . to generate a reusable executable procedure”, as recited in claim 20. Mayuzumi teaches that the storage element (71) stores data such as images, sounds, etc. to be reproduced at the terminal apparatus (50). The stored data (71) is clearly not the same or similar to *a procedure trace repository for storing execution traces the represent an instance of a procedure that is performed using a client device*” as essentially claimed in claim 20.

Moreover, Mayuzumi teaches that the processing unit (74) operates to search and access data in the storage (71) (see, Col. 27, lines 1-15), which is functionally dissimilar, and in stark contrast to the claimed process of *processing a plurality of execution traces associated with instances of an executed procedure to generate a reusable executable procedure*. Claim 20 is patentably distinct and patentable over Mayuzumi. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a supporting explanation with regard to the findings of Mayuzumi with regard to claim 20.

For at least all of the above reasons, withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is requested.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

- (1) Claims 10-19 and 30-34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Horvitz in view of Harel (U.S. Patent No 6,384,843)
- (2) Claims 20-25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Horvitz in view of Sullivan (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240).

Applicants respectfully assert that the above obviousness rejections are legally deficient at least with regard to the Examiner's reliance on the primary reference Horvitz, for those reasons discussed above.

For example, Horvitz does not teach or suggest a reusable executable procedure, much less an executable procedure that may be automatically executed, as essentially recited in claims 10, 20 and 30. Moreover, Horvitz does not teach or suggest *processing a plurality of execution traces associated with instances of an executed procedure to generate a reusable executable procedure*, as essentially recited in claim 20. In short, the Examiner's misplaced reliance on the teachings of Horvitz renders the obviousness rejections legally deficient as a matter of law. Accordingly, claims 10, 20 and 30 are patentable over the combination of Horvitz and the cited references Harel or Sullivan. Moreover, the obviousness rejection of dependent claims of 10, 20, and 30 is legally deficient at least for the same reasons given for base claims 10, 20, and 30. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa

Reg. No. 43,584

Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL.: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889